

1 CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
2 WORKSHOP ON THE VERIFICATION RESULTS OF
3 POU'S HISTORIC CARRYOVER RPS DATA
4
5 Docket No. 11-RPS-01
6 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
7
8
9 1516 Ninth Street, Imbrecht Hearing Room
10 Sacramento, California 95814
11
12 Tuesday, August 18, 2015
13 10:00 a.m.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 Juli Price Jackson
25 CSR 5214

1	INDEX	
2		PAGE
3		
4	Introduction	3
5	Brian McCullough, Energy Commission	4
6	Theresa Daniels, Energy Commission	7
7	Angela Gould, Energy Commission	12
8		
9	Speakers	
10	Tim Trutt SMUD	12
11		
12	Bill Westerfield SMUD	20
13		
14	Kathleen Hughes Silicon Valley Power, via telephone	26
15		
16	---o0o---	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA, AUGUST 18, 2015

2 10:00 a.m.

3 ---o0o---

4 MR. MC CULLOUGH: Good morning. And welcome to
5 the California Energy Commission and our workshop on the
6 Verification Results of Historic Carryover Analysis. And
7 thank you all for coming today.

8 I am Brian McCullough. And joining me in the
9 room is Angela Gould, our RPS Verification and Compliance
10 Technical Lead, and Theresa Daniels, who is our
11 Verification Specialist.

12 We will be taking questions at the end. I'll
13 start with doing some housekeeping and then do an overview
14 of the verification process. And then we will go through
15 an overview of the historic carryover claims. We will
16 take public comments.

17 Those attending in person, please fill out a blue
18 card. And Emily Chisum will be -- she has them in the
19 back. And we'll be collecting those. And following the
20 public comments from those who attended in person, we will
21 be taking comments from those attendees via WebEx, and
22 then, finally, any phone callers. And then we expect to
23 adjourn.

24 First our housekeeping notes. There are
25 restrooms located just outside to the right on the first

1 floor. There's a snack bar located on the second floor.

2 In the event of an emergency or fire alarm,
3 please follow staff. We will exit out the doors right
4 behind us and proceed diagonally across the street to
5 Roosevelt Park.

6 There are handouts available. And they should be
7 by the entrance. And, as I mentioned, there'll be a
8 comment period at the end of the presentation.

9 So, the RPS was originally signed into law with
10 Senate Bill 1078 and -- in 2002, and began with 20 percent
11 of retail sales by renewable energy by 2017. That was
12 accelerated in 2006 to 20 percent by 2010.

13 And then the publicly-owned utilities had to set
14 their own RPS goals, recognizing the intent of the
15 legislation, to attain a target of 20 percent of retail
16 sales by -- from retail sales of electricity from
17 renewable electricity by 2010. This allowed
18 publicly-owned utilities to have flexibility. And, as a
19 result, a variety of compliance measures were taken.

20 And then in April of 2011, Governor Brown signed
21 Senate Bill 1X-2 (sic) into law that established a target
22 of 33 percent by the end of 2020 for all utilities, and
23 included requirements that the Energy Commission implement
24 some regulations governing the compliance oversight of the
25 publicly-owned utilities by the Energy Commission.

1 In those regulations were included a section
2 regarding historic carryover. Historic carryover is
3 calculated based on eligible resources. RPS targets
4 consistent with those for the retail sellers for the
5 period of 2004 through 2010.

6 And those resources -- the eligibility of those
7 resources is in alignment with the rules in place for the
8 retail sellers during that period.

9 Procurement generated before January 1st, 2011
10 that exceeds the POU's target that wasn't sold or
11 otherwise claimed can be applied to RPS procurement
12 requirements for future compliance. And this historic
13 carryover will be calculated beginning on January 1st,
14 2004, or the first year in which the POU was in operation.

15 The rules in place with the retail sellers and
16 our RPS guidelines are established in our RPS Guidebooks.
17 These RPS Eligibility Guidebooks describe the requirements
18 for certifying renewable electricity resources and also
19 include reporting requirements and accounting -- and the
20 accounting system to keep track of that electrical
21 generation.

22 These RPS Guidebooks are the implementation of
23 the statutes that govern the RPS program. And although
24 legislation has been passed several times, those laws do
25 not begin to affect the RPS program until they are

1 implemented through our Guidebooks, as the -- as they have
2 the function of the regulation.

3 One component that is required was proof of
4 electricity delivery. This proof changed as the renewable
5 program progressed. Initial RPS decision documents
6 allowed the eligibility of facilities located outside of
7 California if electricity delivery into the California
8 utility was included in the contract.

9 RPS Eligibility Guidebooks in 2004 through
10 February of 2007 required that the generating facility be
11 listed as the source of the electricity on the -- from
12 March of 2007 on, firming and shaping was allowed. And,
13 so, the e-Tags no longer had to list the RPS eligible
14 facility as the source, but enough e-Tags had to be
15 supplied from within that calendar year to match the claim
16 to show that sufficient imports and electricity were
17 brought into the state to justify that.

18 Initially the renewable portfolio system used the
19 Interim Tracking System. This utilized self-reported data
20 at the stations. There were challenges with the ITS as
21 sometimes it was difficult in identifying the facilities,
22 variable names, different generating units, and how the
23 data was reported were not necessarily consistent.

24 And as time went on we were able to develop and
25 begin utilizing the WREGIS system. And, so, as a result

1 during the historic carryover period we utilized data both
2 that was reported to us through the ITS and also through
3 WREGIS.

4 And after concluding that overview, I'm going to
5 introduce Theresa Daniels, who will be describing the
6 process we used for historic carryover verification.

7 MS. DANIELS: Hi, everyone. I am Theresa
8 Daniels. And thank you all for joining us today.

9 So, in the verification of historic carryover
10 claims, RPS staff used a process that was a consistent
11 verification process for verifying the retail sellers for
12 2001 through 2010 RPS claims.

13 The includes verifying that each claim is from an
14 RPS-certified facility, using data from the Power Source
15 Disclosure Program, other states, such as Oregon and
16 Nevada, and using a voluntary program to determine the
17 claims are not being double counted.

18 Our analysis with Green-e is still ongoing. And
19 if any issues are found, the verification results will be
20 updated.

21 Staff used data reported by the facilities to
22 determine that multi-fuel facilities did not exceed the
23 de minimis amount of 2 percent. If a facility did exceed
24 the de minimus, anything over the percentage of energy
25 produced from the renewable resource was found to be

1 ineligible.

2 Staff verified the energy claims of out-of-state
3 facilities met the energy delivery requirements of that
4 time period.

5 The annual retail sales amounts reported by the
6 POU's were compared with EIA retail sales data.

7 Staff worked closely with the POU's in the
8 verification process. The POU's are contacted about
9 issues with their claims and they are able to submit
10 supplementary documentation to support their claim. This
11 includes invoices, meter data, contract information,
12 POU's use data from RPS-certified facilities to show
13 energy delivery.

14 During the verification process -- during the
15 verification process POU's sometimes make adjustment to
16 their claims. This is done by resubmitting the
17 CEC-RPS-Track forms to add or remove claims. Or if the
18 claims are reported through WREGIS and are unable to be
19 removed from their report, request that it be counted as
20 withdrawn.

21 Once each claim has been verified, the RPS
22 eligible claims are used to calculate each POU's historic
23 carryover. The historic carryover is calculated using the
24 baseline amount and the annual procurement target.
25 Historic carryover is the sum of the quantity of

1 RPS-eligible energy exceeding the APT for each year from
2 2004 through 2010,

3 I'm now going to go over each POU's Historic
4 Verification Results Summary Table and Historic Carryover
5 Calculation Table. These tables can be found on the
6 Energy Commission website at the link on this slide.

7 This is Alameda Municipal Power's Historic
8 Carryover Verification Results Table. Alameda Municipal
9 Power has no ineligible claims or outstanding issues.

10 This is the table used to calculate any POU's
11 historic carryover, which is shown in the surplus for 2004
12 through 2010 in the box at the bottom. This is Alameda
13 Municipal Power's calculated historic theory carryover.

14 This is Azusa Light and Water Historic Carryover
15 Verification Results Table. Azusa Light and Water has no
16 ineligible claims or outstanding issues. This is Azusa
17 Light and Water's historic carryover.

18 The City of -- the City of Banning has no
19 ineligible claims or outstanding issues. This is the City
20 of Banning's claimed historic carryover.

21 The City of Lompoc has no ineligible claims or
22 outstanding issues. This is the City of Lompoc's
23 calculated historic carryover.

24 The City of Palo Alto has no ineligible claims or
25 outstanding issues. This is the City of Palo Alto's

1 calculated historic carryover.

2 Glendale Water and Power has withdrawn 2009 and
3 2010 claims. But there no ineligible claims or
4 outstanding issues. This is Glendale Water and Power's
5 calculated historic carryover.

6 Healdsburg Electric Department has no ineligible
7 claims or outstanding issues. This is Healdsburg Electric
8 Department's calculated historic carryover.

9 Lodi Electric Utility has no ineligible claims or
10 outstanding issues. This is Lodi Electric facility's
11 calculated historic carryover.

12 Modesto Irrigation District has withdrawn claims
13 in 2008 and 2010, but there are no in ineligible claims or
14 outstanding issues. This is Modesto Irrigation District's
15 calculated historic carryover.

16 Power and Water Resources Pooling Authority has
17 ineligible claims from facilities that are not
18 RPS-certified in 2009 and 2010. There are no outstanding
19 issues. This is the Power and Water Resources Pooling
20 Authority's calculated historic carryover.

21 Riverside Public Utilities has 2009 and 2010
22 withdrawn claims, but there are no ineligible claims or
23 outstanding issues. This is Riverside Public Utilities
24 calculated historic carryover.

25 Sacramento Municipal Utility District has

1 ineligible claims from facilities that were RPS-certified
2 up until their contracts with the facilities ended. The
3 2004 through 2009 claims from beyond the contracts ending
4 are listed as ineligible. There are also ineligible 2006
5 and 2007 claims due to energy delivery of the claims not
6 meeting the requirements of the time. There are No
7 outstanding issues. This is Sacramento Municipal Utility
8 District's calculated historic carryover.

9 Silicon Valley Power has no ineligible claims or
10 outstanding issues. This is Silicon Valley Power's
11 calculated historic carryover.

12 Turlock Irrigation District has no ineligible
13 claims or outstanding issues. This is Turlock Irrigation
14 District's calculated historic carryover.

15 Ukiah Electric Utility has ineligible claims for
16 facilities that are not RPS-certified in 2009 and 2010.
17 There is an outstanding issue with our checks in verifying
18 Ukiah Electric Utility's annual retail sales amounts. We
19 are working with Ukiah Electric on clearing up these
20 issues.

21 This is Ukiah Electric Utility's calculated
22 historic carryover. It will be considered pending until
23 the outstanding issues are resolved.

24 So, that's the end of my presentation. And we
25 are now ready for public comment.

1 So, Emily has the filled cards or if anyone or
2 needs a blank one.

3 MS. GOULD: Okay. The first comment is from Tim
4 Tutt of SMUD.

5 MR. TUTT: Thank you. This is Tim Tutt, from the
6 Sacramento Municipal Utility District.

7 And I first want to say that we really
8 appreciated the dialogue that we had with CEC staff as we
9 went through the verification process to date for historic
10 carryover, starting with our claim way back, believe it or
11 not, in December of 2013 and through the recent vetting of
12 the draft tables and so on. It was very much appreciated
13 by SMUD the dialogue that we had.

14 As you know, we appreciate that in part because
15 we had a lot of historic carryover, a lot of contracts.
16 SMUD has been a leader in the global procurement from --
17 dating from the early 2000s, even though we were not
18 required to follow the exact RPS requirements that IOU's
19 were back in the day. We adopted our own RPS that was
20 equivalent to the IOU's RPS requirements and we had an
21 internal policy of following the CEC eligibility
22 requirements to the letter as we went through our
23 procurement structure every year.

24 We even had our own guidebook, which pretty much
25 mirrored the CEC guidebook. Of course, you guys made

1 changes more often than we did, I think.

2 As we went through the historic carryover process
3 at the beginning, we understood that you were setting up a
4 process that was intended to apply equally to everybody,
5 including following what the retail sellers had to do at
6 the time when they were procuring with the RPS.

7 We mentioned at that time that given that it was
8 ten years afterwards, after the actual procurement
9 happened and verification happened for the retail sellers,
10 that it may not be considered equal treatment to require
11 us to follow exact -- the exact same verification
12 processes as the retail sellers had to follow very soon
13 after their procurement.

14 We weren't vetted officially in terms of -- even
15 though we tried to follow procurement requirements, we
16 thought we were -- we weren't vetted officially right at
17 the time and didn't get the benefit -- I don't know if the
18 IOU's or the retail sellers would consider that immediate
19 verification a benefit -- but we didn't have the benefit
20 of getting that feedback at the time.

21 We're getting it now, ten years after the fact,
22 when much of the data that was relied on may not be
23 available, may not be easy to get. We've gone through the
24 process of getting as much of that verification as we can
25 and submitting it to you.

1 And it's all worked pretty well. We've worked
2 through a variety of issues. And we just have a couple of
3 remaining issues that are listed on your table.

4 The 2006 and 2007 disallowance because it didn't
5 meet the delivery requirements at the time, we don't agree
6 with at this point. This was from a contract that we had
7 started in December of 2006. It was disallowed in our
8 communications with you because it was not -- it was a
9 firm and shaping contract, which wasn't allowed until
10 March 2007.

11 We contend this is not a firming and shaping
12 contract. This contract is a contract in which we procure
13 resources and they're delivered at the same time as
14 they're generated. They're not firmed. They're not
15 shaped. It's simultaneous delivery to California, which
16 was allowed, in our minds, by the March -- by the 2006
17 Guidebook in place at the time.

18 We're procuring from multiple resources from the
19 same owner, not a single resource. So, we do get a
20 variety of renewable generation from that owner, but we
21 are procuring local generation from specific facilities --
22 not from any fossil resources, not any firming or shaping
23 separate contracts from those facilities.

24 And we have e-Tag documentation of that, which we
25 have submitted to you. Our e-Tag documentation

1 consistently includes either the name of the facilities in
2 the contract field or RPS ID numbers in the contract field
3 or the miscellaneous field. It consistently shows you
4 where that procurement comes from.

5 So, we don't think it's a firming and shaping
6 contract. We think it is similar to anybody buying
7 renewable under a direct simultaneous delivery contract
8 from out of state, out of California.

9 Even if it were thought of as a firming and
10 shaping contract, we contend that the rules that were
11 adopted in the March 2007 Guidebook should be applied
12 retroactively at least to January of 2007 -- January 1st,
13 2007, because that's when SB 107 was effective.

14 And in the Guidebooks that you adopted in March
15 of 2007, you adopted an overall Guidebook, as well as an
16 RPS Guidebook and others. And in that overall Guidebook
17 you said that -- there was the line that the provisions of
18 these Guidebooks that are adopted are effective starting
19 January 1st, 2007.

20 So, you have written determination adopted
21 simultaneously with the RPS Guidebook that it should be
22 effective on January 1st, 2007, at the very least.

23 And we contend, as I said earlier, that the
24 December generation is also eligible because it was
25 eligible under the 2006 Guidebook. It's not a firming and

1 shaping arrangement.

2 Going back to telling you when we filed our claim
3 that you have to take into account the time involved
4 between the procurement and the claim and the
5 verification.

6 And it's not necessarily equal treatment to
7 require exactly the same verification as you did for
8 retail sellers. Even with the retail sellers, there were
9 things that were inadvertently mistaken in the comment
10 field versus the miscellaneous field. You accepted all
11 those claims. You gave them some leeway.

12 We're just looking for some leeway here too.
13 SMUD has procured from 2001 on in good faith. And our
14 goal is to have all that procurement recognized -- our
15 early action recognized.

16 You seem to be fairly strict and tight on
17 applying the provisions of the Guidebooks even five, six,
18 ten years later, in all cases except for the 2001
19 baseline. And the 2001 baseline the FAQs on the website
20 for historic carryover says that,

21 "Any procurement from contracts
22 signed prior to the first Guidebook, that
23 the provisions of the first Guidebook would
24 apply."

25 The first Guidebook requires deliverability.

1 We're not able to prove deliverability for one contract in
2 2001, and yet you've accepted that procurement.

3 It just seems like you're tight and very detailed
4 about our historic carryover claim when it's a claim that
5 would give us the procurement that we -- we, in good
6 faith, procured.

7 But in a case where by questioning or accepting
8 with a little bit more loosely our procurement, where that
9 procurement will increase our -- if you disallow it, it
10 will increase our historic carryover, you have taken a
11 looser approach.

12 We would like a consistent approach that reflects
13 the fact that it's difficult to verify to the every -- you
14 know, "I" dotted and "T" crossed all through the period,
15 not an approach in which -- where it hurts us, you are
16 loose, and where it helps us, you are strict.

17 Thank you.

18 MS GOULD: Thank you, Tim.

19 Actually, Brian, do you want to address that
20 point about the 2001 verification delivery?

21 MR. MC CULLOUGH: This is Brian McCullough and
22 thank you very much for raising this point.

23 And I think that in alignment with the FAQs for
24 historic carryover that are posted on the website, this is
25 something worthy of further discussion, and look forward

1 to doing that.

2 MS. GOULD: There was something that read that
3 for 2001 generation that it only required delivery in the
4 contract, and not e-Tag demonstration with the source. We
5 will look further into it, I suppose.

6 And I have not looked at the language in the
7 overall Guidebook that was in place at the time, it was
8 the second edition, but whatever was place in 2006 and
9 2007, so, I will have to look at that language and see
10 what it says about effective dates and how that applies to
11 the RPS Eligibility Guidebook.

12 But, in general, the Guidebook's adoption date
13 determines when the rule implementation begins, unless the
14 rule is retroactive.

15 And that is regardless of when the law becomes
16 effective per statute. So, that is how the law has been
17 implemented since the beginning of the RPS for the retail
18 sellers.

19 And we wanted to implement a consistent rule for
20 the retail sellers and the POU's. And I do, you know,
21 understand the difficulty of trying to go back ten years
22 or more and find documentation for all of these things.

23 But that's the situation we're in, unfortunately.
24 This is an opportunity for POU'S to get additional
25 generation and to get something for their early actions.

1 And we appreciate all of the early actions that
2 SMUD took and setting those high standards when you didn't
3 necessarily have to.

4 And this is a way for all those POU's who did
5 that to get rewarded for it. But we do want to be
6 consistent and to not allow -- not apply looser rules to
7 the POU's, 'cause this is generation that will be applied
8 to the 2011 and later procurements.

9 And we want to be sure that we're applying the
10 stricter standards.

11 There are other points that were covered that I
12 missed, but -- yeah, we will look at the overall guidebook
13 and see what that says.

14 MR. TUTT: Thanks for the response.

15 I was just pointing out in return that in the
16 overall Guidebook that was adopted in March of 2007, it
17 does contain, I think, the standard phrase or paragraph
18 that says that, in general, changes are effective when the
19 Guidebook is adopted, unless it's specifically made
20 retroactive in the Guidebook.

21 And we are just contending that that January 1st,
22 2007 date -- assuming you don't accept our earlier
23 argument that it is an all eligible procurement -- that
24 that January 1st, 2007 date is in the same Guidebook and
25 says that provisions that adopted shall apply back to that

1 date.

2 MS. GOULD: Yeah, we -- the delivery standards at
3 that time for retail sellers were very strict. I think to
4 the point that there was no out-of-state generation
5 accepted at that time from retail sellers because it was
6 so difficult to show.

7 And it did require in the Guidebook that -- that
8 the specific source, the actual individual generator, be
9 listed as the source on the e-Tag, which is one of the
10 reasons it was difficult at the time to get any
11 out-of-state delivery.

12 And I think we didn't have any until 2007, when
13 firming and shaping was allowed.

14 Thank you, Tim.

15 Then Bill Westerfield, also from SMUD.

16 MR. WESTERFIELD: Thank you, Angie.

17 I think Tim has really made most of the points
18 that I would have otherwise made.

19 I might again just stress on both of these same
20 issues that he raised. First of all, I would -- we would
21 at SMUD like our conversation here to be an open dialogue
22 where we talk back and forth about these issues. We have
23 had a very good experience thus far. We would like to
24 keep that.

25 We don't see this as a forum where we're trying

1 to you surprise you in any way. We want to give you our
2 points, why we think our points are appropriate. We'll do
3 get whatever we can so we can reach the right answer. And
4 that is all we've ever wanted to do is make appropriate
5 claims.

6 I think consistency is a really important issue
7 for us. Tim made that point, but it does come up because
8 we feel like we need consistency in the verification
9 requirements.

10 We -- as we look at how you again apply the rules
11 to our 2001 procurement versus our 2006, it does feel like
12 you're applying the rules of verification inconsistently
13 to increase our baseline in 2001, but to reduce our
14 procurement in 2006 -- both of which serve to reduce our
15 historic carryover.

16 So, we're just asking that you apply the rules
17 consistently for us, just as you have for the IOU's. It
18 may be that the IOU's were not able to prove out-of-state
19 delivery in 2007 because of the e-Tag issue.

20 We have e-Tags for the period of December 2006,
21 January and February 2007, they are at issue in our
22 contract. Those e-Tags do show the facilities ID numbers
23 RPS ID numbers on those e-Tags.

24 Or if those numbers aren't always reported, it
25 does indicate that they -- the generation comes from the

1 renewable facilities.

2 So, we feel like we complied with the express
3 requirements in the applicable Guidebook, the April 2006
4 Guidebook.

5 We have gone through those requirements in
6 detail. We think we met every one of those. However, we
7 were told in one of the responses that -- that we didn't
8 meet the requirements at the time for that generation.

9 So, we really don't know what requirements you
10 are referring to that we didn't meet.

11 So, that's been one of the puzzling things for
12 us. And we'd appreciate hearing from you as to what
13 particular requirements you are saying that we didn't
14 meet.

15 MS. GOULD: For that issue I believe it would be
16 having the source on the e-Tag be the individual facility
17 that's being claimed from.

18 MR. WESTERFIELD: Okay. If that's the case, then
19 we ask you to look at that again because we think we have
20 satisfied those requirements.

21 I know it's a little difficult when we go back to
22 this period of December 2006 and for the March 2007
23 Guidebook. Of course we've been told that our Vista
24 contract was a firming and shaping contract. And Tim has
25 made some points why we don't think it is a firming and

1 shaping contract.

2 When we look at the April 2006 Guidebook, the
3 applicable Guidebook, it's completely silent about any
4 standards or any rules for firming and shaping.

5 So, when we try and look at the rules that
6 applied to the retail sellers at the time, you don't see
7 any rules at all in the Guidebook that define firming and
8 shaping at the time.

9 So, it's hard to understand why our -- it would
10 have been denied on that ground when there is no express
11 criteria in the Guidebooks to support that. But I
12 understand your position that and we do ask --

13 MS. GOULD: And you're saying that was between
14 December 2006 and February 2007?

15 MR. WESTERFIELD: That's right. I mean, we
16 really have basically two positions about that generation.

17 We feel that the applicable Guidebook in April
18 2006 permitted generation under a contract like
19 dissemination from several renewable power plants under
20 the rules in place at the time.

21 But then, in addition, your March 2007 Guidebook,
22 which we think is retroactive to January 1st, clarified
23 any doubt there may be that that kind of generation should
24 be allowed.

25 I believe when I look at the existing Guidebook

1 and the law, SB 67, that was applicable in December 2006,
2 at most it was unclear about procurement from several
3 different renewable facilities within one balancing
4 authority.

5 I really believe that it was allowed under the
6 law and it was allowed under your Guidebook. And I
7 believe at the time the Energy Commission saw the
8 uncertainty that that provided in marketplace and,
9 therefore, wrote the March 2007 Guidebook to clarify any
10 uncertainty that the marketplace had about that contract.

11 Not that the rules were changed in March 2007,
12 but that you issued guidelines to clarify what was
13 permitted under the law.

14 So, I guess our position is that you permitted it
15 already, but then your Guidebook, retroactive to
16 January 1st, clarified that it was.

17 So, then I'd like to maybe make one more point.
18 Tim has mentioned that the Energy Commission has been
19 realistic to some extent and provided some leeway to the
20 IOU's as they reach back in time to present evidence on
21 claims and that we would like some of the same leeway.

22 My position that we don't -- we aren't asking for
23 any leeway, we believe that our claims are valid on the
24 face and really no particular leeway is really needed.

25 I find that our claims are consistent with the

1 rules in place at the time, and feel strong about that.

2 So --

3 MS. GOULD: All right. Our intention is
4 definitely not to be more punitive toward the POU's than
5 we have been to the retail sellers.

6 And I think what you are referring to is allowing
7 some leeway in the RPS ID in the miscellaneous field of
8 the e-Tags weren't put in properly. That's often a
9 miscommunication with balancing authorities, something
10 like that.

11 So, yeah, we have allowed some leeway there in
12 the past. And I don't think we required that at all for
13 the -- for the POU's at the time. So, I don't think we're
14 being more difficult or requiring more from the POU's.

15 And I do not think that we allowed any leeway in
16 having the source included as from -- or having the source
17 on the e-Tag be the facility that the generation came from
18 at that time.

19 So, I think it's -- that's not leeway that we
20 allowed the retail sellers that we're now withholding from
21 the POU's.

22 But we will review those books again as well as
23 the overall Guidebook and we'll look at that internally.

24 MR. WESTERFIELD: We appreciate that, thank you.

25 MS. DANIELS: Anyone else? Blue cards?

1 Is there anyone on the WebEx?

2 MR. MC CULLOUGH: Okay. No comments on WebEx?

3 Okay.

4 MS. GOULD: How about the phone lines? And

5 people on the phones, please mute your lines if you are

6 not planning to speak.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. MC CULLOUGH: Any questions from the phone?

9 MS. HUGHES: Hello.

10 MS. GOULD: Yes, go ahead.

11 MS. HUGHES: Hi, this is Kathy Hughes from

12 Silicon Valley Power, City of Santa Clara.

13 I am sorry. I had a very bad reception on parts

14 of that, the presentation, So, I apologize.

15 My question is addressing the ATO and the

16 compliance for upcoming compliance periods.

17 Is it to be treated just like the PCC-0

18 currently?

19 MS. GOULD: Yes, it would be treated like PCC-0.

20 All historic carryover, by definition under the

21 regulations, is from pre June 1st, 2010 contracts.

22 MS. HUGHES: Okay.

23 MS. GOULD: So, that is what PCC-0 is. So, it

24 will be treated the same. And it can be used just like

25 excess procurements can.

1 MS. HUGHES: Okay.

2 MS. GOULD: Where it can be applied -- they can
3 just choose an amount the wish to apply to any compliance
4 period.

5 MS. HUGHES: And then this maybe -- well, I don't
6 know if it's relevant, for the first compliance period for
7 that procurement -- excess procurement, will those numbers
8 be forthcoming soon about what we had excess on those as
9 well?

10 MS. GOULD: Yeah, we're currently working through
11 the first compliance period verification and the first
12 round of verification. That includes all of the utilities
13 and should end this year.

14 And the POU portfolio content category
15 verification will continue through early next year.

16 So, we won't have --

17 MS. HUGHES: Okay.

18 MS. GOULD: -- final numbers for that until
19 probably mid-2016.

20 MS. HUGHES: Well, thank you -- thank you for all
21 your work and everything.

22 This has been a very educational process.

23 Thank you.

24 MS. GOULD: For us too.

25 Thank you.

1 Any further comments on the phone?
2 MR. MC CULLOUGH: Hearing none, hearing no
3 comments, any further comments in the room?
4 And seeing none, I think we'll adjourn.
5 Thank you very much.
6 (The proceedings concluded at 10:49 a.m.)

7

8 ---o0o---

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I certify that the foregoing proceeding was taken at the time and place therein named; and the testimony was reported by me, a duly certified shorthand reporter and disinterested person, and was thereafter transcribed in my presence.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said proceeding, nor in any way interested in the outcome for the cause named in said caption.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 31st day of August, 2015.

JULI PRICE JACKSON, CSR No. 5214
State of California

---o0o---